

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

**LEGO Holding A/S v. CONG TY TNHH TU VAN DICH VU VA SAN XUAT
THUONG MAI LIAN**

Case No. D2026-1547

1. The Parties

The Complainant is LEGO Holding A/S, Denmark, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is CONG TY TNHH TU VAN DICH VU VA SAN XUAT THUONG MAI LIAN, Viet Nam.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lianlego.com> (“the Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with P.A. Viet Nam Company Limited (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 13, 2026. On April 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On April 14, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, disclosing registrant and contact information for the Disputed Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Domain Admin, Domain Whois Protection Service) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 16, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint in English on April 17, 2026.

On April 16, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Vietnamese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the Disputed Domain Name is Vietnamese. On April 17, 2026, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceedings. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent in Vietnamese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 24, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 14, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 18, 2026.

The Center appointed Pham Nghiem Xuan Bac as the sole panelist in this matter on May 27, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant, LEGO Holding A/S, which is renamed from LEGO Juris A/S, is a Denmark-based corporation that owns the LEGO trademark and other trademarks used in connection with construction toys and other LEGO branded products. The Complainant has subsidiaries and branches throughout the world, and LEGO products are sold in more than 130 countries, including in Viet Nam.

According to Superbrands United Kingdom (the "UK"), the LEGO brand was ranked as number 2 in Top 10 Consumer Superbrands and number 2 in the Consumer Relevancy Index in the year 2023. The Reputation Institute recognized the LEGO Group as number one for the second year in a row on its list of the world's Top 10 Most Reputable Global Companies of 2024. In 2000, Forbes and Toy Retailers Association of the each announced LEGO bricks to be the Toy of the Century and in 2024 Circana named The LEGO Group Global Toy Manufacturer of the year for the third year in a row.

The Complainant is the proprietor of numerous trademark registrations for the mark LEGO in jurisdictions worldwide, including Viet Nam since 1990 (Registration No. 4-0001371-000 and registered on February 13, 1990). The Complainant has also authorized various licensees to exploit its intellectual property rights, including its trademark rights, in Viet Nam and other jurisdictions.

The Complainant has established a significant online presence and owns more than 6,000 domain names incorporating the LEGO trademark. The Complainant maintains, among others, the websites operating under the domain names <lego.com> and <legoland.com>, which attract substantial Internet traffic. According to the evidence submitted, the website at <lego.com> received approximately 38 million visits in January 2025 alone and ranks among the most visited websites globally.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on December 24, 2025. As of the date of this Decision, the Disputed Domain Name does not resolve to an active website and appears to be suspended. However, the evidence on record, including historical screenshots of the associated website, demonstrates that the Disputed Domain Name was previously used in connection with a website offering building brick products under the name "LianLego".

As evidenced in the Complaint, the Complainant's attorneys sent to the Respondent three cease and desist letters with regard to the Disputed Domain Name on January 23, February 4, and February 13, 2026 in which the Complainant asked for, amongst others, a voluntary transfer of such Disputed Domain Name. However, the Respondent did not reply.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that each of the elements specified in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied in the present case, as follows:

(i) The Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark, in which the Complainant has rights.

The Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to its well-known LEGO trademark. The dominant element of the Disputed Domain Name is the term “lego”, which is identical to the Complainant’s registered trademark. The additional term “lian” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity while the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com” is a standard registration requirement and should be disregarded when examining confusing similarity under the Policy.

The Complainant further submits that LEGO is a famous and highly distinctive trademark, as recognized in numerous previous UDRP decisions. The Complainant also argues that the Respondent’s use of the Disputed Domain Name for a website offering goods competing with those of the Complainant reinforces the likelihood of confusion and demonstrates an intention to target the Complainant’s trademark.

Accordingly, the Complainant submits that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

(ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant states that it has never authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the LEGO trademark or to register any domain name incorporating that mark. Nor is the Respondent an authorized distributor, reseller, or business partner of the Complainant.

According to the Complainant, there is no evidence that the Respondent owns any trademark rights corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name or that the Respondent is commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. The Whois information identifies the Respondent as “Cong Ty TNHH Tu Van Dich Vu Va San Xuat Thuong Mai Lian”, a name which bears no resemblance to the Disputed Domain Name.

The Complainant further submits that, given the worldwide reputation and distinctiveness of the LEGO trademark, the Respondent was necessarily aware of the Complainant and its rights when registering the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant argues that the Respondent selected the Disputed Domain Name precisely because of its association with the well-known LEGO mark.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name. Instead, the Disputed Domain Name resolves to a commercial website offering building block products that compete directly with those of the Complainant. By using a domain name incorporating the LEGO trademark, the Respondent is said to be seeking to attract Internet users by creating a false impression of association with the Complainant for commercial gain.

Finally, the Complainant notes that Mail Exchange (“MX”) records have been configured for the Disputed Domain Name, which, in the circumstances of the case, creates a potential risk of misleading email communications or phishing activities. The Complainant therefore submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name within the meaning of the Policy.

(iii) The Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant submits that the LEGO trademark is highly distinctive and well known worldwide, including in Viet Nam. Given the fame and longstanding reputation of the LEGO mark, the Respondent could not reasonably have been unaware of the Complainant’s rights when registering the Disputed Domain Name. According to the Complainant, the incorporation of the LEGO trademark in the Disputed Domain Name was intended to capitalize on the goodwill associated with that mark.

The Complainant further states that it attempted to resolve the matter amicably by sending cease-and-desist correspondence to the Respondent and requesting the voluntary transfer of the Disputed Domain Name. Despite follow-up communications, the Respondent did not reply.

The Complainant also argues that the Disputed Domain Name resolves to a commercial website offering building block products that compete directly with the Complainant's products. By using a domain name incorporating the LEGO trademark in connection with competing goods, the Respondent is said to be intentionally attracting Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. The Complainant submits that such conduct constitutes evidence of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

In addition, the Complainant contends that the Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name disrupts the Complainant's business and falls within the scope of paragraph 4(b)(iii) of the Policy, as the Respondent is using the Disputed Domain Name to promote products that compete with those of the Complainant.

Accordingly, the Complainant submits that the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

With the said arguments, the Complainant requests that the Disputed Domain Name be transferred to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Language of the Proceedings

The language of the Registration Agreement for the Disputed Domain Name is Vietnamese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceedings be English for several reasons: (i) The Complainant is a Danish company and is unable to communicate in Vietnamese. Requiring the Complaint and supporting evidence to be translated into Vietnamese would impose significant additional costs and delay upon the Complainant, contrary to the Policy's objective of providing an efficient and cost-effective mechanism for resolving domain name disputes; and (ii) the Disputed Domain Name is composed entirely of Latin characters and incorporates the well-known trademark LEGO, a coined term that has no meaning in the Vietnamese language.

The Respondent did not make any submissions with respect to the language of the proceedings.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see [WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions \("WIPO Overview 3.1"\)](#), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceedings shall be English.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the Disputed Domain Name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The addition of other term here, "lian", does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

In addition, the Panel determines that the addition of the gTLD ".com" in the Disputed Domain Name is disregarded, as it is viewed as a technical necessity. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds that the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of "proving a negative", requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy lists circumstances, in particular but without limitation, which, if found by the Panel to be proved, demonstrate the Respondent's rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, including:

"(i) before any notice to you of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or

(ii) you (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the domain name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

(iii) you are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue."

Regarding paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, the Panel finds, based on the evidence submitted by the Complainant, that the Respondent was not granted any license, permission, or authorization to register or use the LEGO trademark or the Disputed Domain Name. There is no indication that the Respondent owns any registered or unregistered trademark rights in any jurisdiction corresponding to the designation “LEGO” or to the Disputed Domain Name.

The evidence shows that the website associated with the Disputed Domain Name offers for sale creative building blocks for kids in the name of “LianLego” which contains the trademark LEGO of the Complainant (as does the Disputed Domain Name itself).

In the Panel's view, incorporating the Complainant's well-known trademark for offering for sale competing products does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy.

Regarding paragraphs 4(c)(ii) and 4(c)(iii) of the Policy, the Panel finds no evidence that the Respondent, whether as an individual, business, or other organization, has been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, nor is there any indication that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of it. The Panel takes note of the fact that the Registrar-confirmed Respondent's name translates into English as “Lian Trading, Manufacturing, Service, and Consulting Co., Ltd” and, as such includes “Lian”, however, notes that no reason was advanced by the Respondent – and none is otherwise apparent to the panel – for inclusion of the Complainant's world famous LEGO trademark alongside that element in the Disputed Domain Name. Furthermore, assuming that company exists, the incorporation of a company without further evidence of a legitimate business cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests. In the present case, the evidence indicates that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and used with knowledge of the Complainant's LEGO trademark and with the intention of capitalizing on the goodwill and reputation associated with that trademark.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith, including:

“(i) circumstances indicating that you have registered or you have acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the Complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) you have registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) you have registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your website or location or of a product or service on your website or location.”

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Complainant has put forth evidence that the Respondent has registered and used the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith. The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions and, therefore, did not refute the Complainant's contentions.

The Panel has considered the Complainant's assertions and evidence concerning the Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name. The Panel notes that the Complainant's LEGO trademark has been registered and extensively used in numerous jurisdictions worldwide, including Viet Nam, where the Respondent resides, and has acquired a significant recognition in creative toys and bricks industry. These trademark rights and their associated reputation clearly predate the registration of the Disputed Domain Name.

The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's LEGO trademark in its entirety, with the addition of the term "lian"- an element of the business name of the Respondent. Given the distinctiveness of the LEGO trademark and its established use, the Panel finds it implausible that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name without knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark. Rather, the Panel considers that the Respondent deliberately selected the Disputed Domain Name to create an association with the Complainant.

The Panel further observes that the Disputed Domain Name resolves to a website offering creative bricks products under "LianLego". Such use is liable to mislead Internet users into believing that the website is operated by, affiliated with, or endorsed by the Complainant.

The Panel therefore concludes that, by using the Disputed Domain Name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website and the products offered thereon. This constitutes evidence of bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel also notes that the Disputed Domain Name has been configured with MX records. Although there is no evidence of actual phishing or fraudulent email activity, the Panel considers that the capability of the Disputed Domain Name to be used for email communications, coupled with its incorporation of the Complainant's well-known trademark, signals a risk of potential abusive conduct and supports the inference of bad faith. This is consistent with section 3.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), which recognizes email-based impersonation and other abusive conduct as a relevant factor in assessing bad faith.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the Disputed Domain Name <lianlego.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Pham Nghiem Xuan Bac/

Pham Nghiem Xuan Bac

Sole Panelist

Date: June 10, 2026